



SGW

1657

PTO/SB/21 (08-03)

Approved for use through 08/30/2003. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	09/993,348	
	Filing Date	November 10, 2001	
	First Named Inventor	Parwinder Grewal	
	Art Unit	1651	
	Examiner Name	Deborah Ware	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	1	Attorney Docket Number	22727/04028

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance communication to Technology Center (TC)
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached	<input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
<input type="checkbox"/> After Final	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application	<input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information
<input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation	<input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter
<input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
<input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer	
<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement	<input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund	
<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application	Remarks Return receipt postcard	
<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT	
Firm or Individual name	Sean C. Myers-Payne Reg. No. 42,920
Signature	<i>Sean Myers-Payne</i>
Date	May 3, 2004

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING			
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.			
Typed or printed name	Janet L. Norris		
Signature	<i>Janet L. Norris</i>	Date	May 3, 2004

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Election

Applicant elects Group I, i.e., claims 1-13, 15-17, and 31, *with traverse*.

The Office carefully makes the case that the claims of Groups I, II, and III, are *distinct*:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be *distinct* if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (M.P.E.P. § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the product as claimed can be used for suspending nematodes. Further, the methods of Group I and Group III are related as processes but are two different processes and require different process steps. Also the Groups II and III are related as product and process of use, however, the product can be used to protect plants. Thus, one way *distinctness* is established between the processes and product. Further, the methods of Group I and III are *distinct* and different as discussed above. Therefore, two way *distinctness* exists between the two different and distinct methods.

(Office Action, page 2, lines 10-21, emphasis added.) Without more, the Office concludes by stating that because distinctiveness has been shown, restriction is proper. (*Id.* at page 3, first and second paragraphs.)

Applicant submits that restriction is not proper in this instance. M.P.E.P. § 803 states the requirement for a *proper* restriction.

There are two criteria for a proper requirement for restriction between patentably distinct inventions: (A) The inventions must be independent or distinct as claimed; **and (B) There must be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is required.**

(M.P.E.P. § 803, citations omitted, emphasis added.) Thus, there are *two* requirements for restriction: distinctness *and* a serious burden. Both are required; distinctness without a serious burden is not sufficient to justify restriction. Indeed, section 803 explicitly states that “[i]f the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.”

Applicant respectfully submits that restriction is not proper in this case. While the claims of Groups I, II, and III may satisfy the Office's requirements for distinctness, their consideration would hardly result in a serious burden on the Office. In fact, the Office had already considered *and searched* claims 1-21 prior to Applicant's previous amendment. Thus, at the very least, the Office should consider Groups I and II (i.e., claims 1-21 and 31) together.

If issues relating to this application can be resolved by discussion, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone. If any fees are due for consideration of this Response, the undersigned hereby authorizes the Office to charge those fees to Applicant's deposit account no. 03-0172.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

May 3, 2004

Sean Myers-Payne

Sean C. Myers-Payne

Reg. No. 42,920

(614) 621-7754

(614) 621-0010 (fax)

smyers-payne@calfee.com